



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"In the first century, or perhaps in the second, there reigned in the valley of the Indus the Buddhist Emperor Kanishka, whose famous council did so much to give political prestige to patristic Buddhism. One of this monarch's coins, which has come down to us, actually has on it the image of Buddha, with his name in Greek letters:

ΒΟΔΔΟ

"Wherever this coin circulated the name of Buddha would be known, and many a Greek may have seen it for the first time thereupon."

In the first century people from India were living in Alexandria and the influence of their fables is traceable in the Talmud; and in the same century a manual of the Egyptian trade with India was written. Within about two centuries of the beginning of the Christian era mention was made by Virgil, Horace, Pliny and Clement of Alexandria, of distant people of Hindu origin who, according to the descriptions of these writers, are presumably none other than the Buddhists in China. Two incidents of the second century are noteworthy: (1) the mention of Buddha by Clement of Alexandria, and (2) the finding of the Gospel of Matthew in India, and by the end of the fourth century the doctrines of John had been translated by the Hindus as well as by the Syrians, Egyptians, and Persians. Possible allusions to Christianity have been noticed too, in the great Indian epic, the Mahabharata.

By these and many other incidents Mr. Edmunds shows the possibility of intercourse between the East and the West in the times of the establishment of Christianity; between Rome and the Ganges by way of Alexandria, Antioch and Bactria. This intercourse being proven he tries to show that Buddhist influence is traceable in the Gospel of Luke and this not in identity of text (except a partial verbal agreement between the Angelic hymns) but rather in the matter of sequence of narrative.

---

DER VORCHRISTLICHE JESUS. Von *William Benjamin Smith*. Mit einem Vorworte von *Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel*. Giessen: Alfred Tötelmann, 1906.

William Benjamin Smith's work on the prehistoric Jesus, published in a German translation before the original appeared, and prefaced by his most eager antagonist Prof. Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel of Zürich, is a most remarkable phenomenon in the history of theological literature. Theologians as a rule are suspected of partiality, and the *furor theologicus* has become proverbial, yet Professor Schmiedel who represents the traditional and more orthodox stamp, deems it wise to have this most radical conception of the origin of the Christ ideal made accessible to the German theologians. He explains in the preface that these errors need refutation, and if they are errors they ought to be easily refuted, yet finding them so ably presented he challenges his colleagues to assist him in working up the field and combating the common danger.

Professor Schmiedel sums up Professor Smith's theory as follows:

The doctrine of Jesus is pre-Christian. It is a cult which between 100 B. C. and 100 A. D. had become current among Jews, and especially among the Hellenists, veiled more or less in mysteries. Christianity took its origin from several foci, and only according to a later theory from one alone, viz.,

Jerusalem. Jesus was from the beginning nothing but a deity, namely,—the liberator, the preserver, the saviour, the Nazarene. He was called Nazarene not from a town Nazareth, which in those days did not exist, but according to the Hebrew sense of the word, viz., the preserver. His *anastasis* meant originally his being put up in the sense of being installed, viz., as Messiah, the dispenser of the world and judge of the quick and the dead. Later on the addition "from the dead" modified the meaning of the term which henceforth signified "resurrection." There were two doctrines, first the one of John the Baptist, more severe and stern, proclaiming the advent of the Christ, the Messiah; and the other more gentle one of Jesus. These two were originally different movements, but they were finally merged into one religion culminating in the ideal of Jesus Christ.

Further, Smith claims that the Epistle to the Romans was not known before the year 160 A. D., and its authenticity is thereby seriously questioned. Professor Schmiedel has risen as an adversary to Smith, and has criticized his view in the *Hibbard Journal*, January, 1903. Accordingly, Schmiedel can not be accused of being a partisan who advocates Professor Smith's cause for trivial or personal reasons. On the contrary, he introduces him to the theological public because he deems it a duty to have the problems of Professor Smith discussed, and if possible finally disposed of. These questions Schmiedel claims are not unessential accidents, but the most essential part of Christian doctrines forming the foundation of our religion.

Professor Smith, though not a theologian, (for he is professor of mathematics at Tulane University) is so well equipped in theological knowledge that he deserves a hearing, and a refutation of his views will prove no easy task. The book needs deep study and can not be hurriedly digested, for the array of facts is formidable and learned, and it takes a special theologian to enter into Professor Smith's arguments. Specimens of his work have appeared in the *Hibbard Journal* and in *The Monist*. The *Hibbard Journal* contained an article on the Epistle to the Romans which is analysed into several fragments of different origin. His *Monist* article treats the very difficult problem of the Nazarene, in which for the first time he propounds his theory of Jesus the Nazarene as a pre-Christian deity of a Gnostic sect. The present book is not yet a complete exposition of Professor Smith's theory, but merely a preliminary statement of its most essential points fortified by argument, the strength of which seems to take hold of the reader gradually. The book contains five chapters: (1) The Pre-Christian Jesus. (2) The Meaning of the Epithet Nazorean, (3) Anastasis, (4) The Sower Sows the Logos, (5) *Sæculi Silentium*.

We have set forth our own views concerning the origin of Christianity in a number of articles published partly in *The Monist*, partly in *The Open Court*, and we find Professor Smith's views similar in many respects. Like him we insist that Christianity has originated from a pre-Christian movement, and almost all its essential doctrines have been prepared by religious sects which were more or less due to the syncretism that originated from the mixture of the nations after the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great. Gnosticism was a pre-Christian movement, and the religion of the Nazarenes was one among many kindred movements. Mithraism, the reverence shown to Apollonius of Tyana, the Greco-Egyptian sects such as the Therapeutæ,

also the worship of Hermes Trismegistos as the divine word, and the continuation of the worship of Ptah, the word from whom the world had been made, were products of the same general movement. It is therefore quite natural that on closer investigation all these different faiths are found to be similar. They all teach an immortality of the individual soul; they are more or less dualistic; they show a tendency toward asceticism; they hold fast to the belief in a universal religion, or at least in the universality of religious truths; they proclaim a mediator between God and man, an incarnation of the deity or representative of God on earth, either in the shape of a mythical personality such as Mithras, or the incarnation of a sage such as Socrates, Apollonius of Tyana, or Jesus the Nazarene. This new religion that is preparing itself is really the essence of the sum total of all the pagan religions preceding Christianity in its ideas of the God-man, the Saviour, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, the renewal of the world, the establishment of a kingdom of heaven on earth, and kindred hopes. Hence have arisen many pre-Christian movements anticipating such Christian doctrines as the trinity, which is definitely provable in the case of Simon Magus, the existence of wandering preachers like Apollos who taught the Christ and was conversant with the doctrines of "the Lord," without ever having heard of Jesus. Among these prophets of the new religion there were many Jews, who on account of their rigid and iconoclastic monotheism we must assume played a very prominent part, and St. Paul among them succeeded in focusing this worldwide movement upon Jesus. If he had not succeeded in his aspirations, if some other rival sect had succeeded in establishing itself we might have other names, perhaps also other sacred scriptures, but the new religion would have practically become the same in doctrine and ethical ideas. It would have passed through the same phases of dualism and in general outlines would have followed the same course of development. If for instance Apollonius of Tyana had become the deity of the new faith, the Platonic, Neo-Platonic or Stoic writings would have become to us what the Old Testament is now to Christians. If the Mithraists had been victorious, the Zendavesta would have taken the place of the Hebrew scriptures, and our theologians would study the Gathas in place of the prophets. They would look upon Zarathushtra as the great prophet of antiquity who had prepared the way of the saviour.

Professor Smith corroborates this general conception concerning the origin of Christianity, yet he goes beyond it. He establishes in addition some details concerning the very origin of the idea of Jesus as a Nazarene and for the first time shakes our belief in the authenticity of the epistles of St. Paul, which heretofore had been accepted as genuine even by the most radical critics. We might add incidentally that the conservative class of German theologians slowly follow in the wake of the same general tendency. We will call attention to Professor Pfeiderer's distinction between Jesus and Christ, which implies that Christianity as it is interpreted in orthodox quarters is practically a Jesuanity, and that in order to become true Christianity, it would have to overcome the historical error of the identification of Jesus and Christ.

We have watched Professor Smith's publications with great interest, and though we are not prepared to follow him in all details, we are convinced

that he should have a fair hearing, and that his labors will considerably promote the solution of the main problems of New Testament theology.

---

DER DOPPELTE STANDPUNKT IN DER PSYCHOLOGIE. Von *Mary Whiton Calkins*.  
Leipsc: Von Veit, 1905. For sale by C. A. Köhler & Co., 149 Tremont  
St., Boston. Pp. 80.

By double standpoint, Prof. Mary W. Calkins does not mean the parallelism of Weber, Fechner, Wundt and others who have made use of the term to express psychical phenomena in physical terms, but the two opposite view-points which are present in psychology. There are two schools: one looks upon soul as a combination of psychic states, and interprets them to be realities of life; while the other assumes the existence of a soul, and interprets those sentiments, volitions, etc., as the manifestations of the soul. It goes without saying that either the soul is, as the traditional soul-conception teaches, an absolute unit; or it is as Wundt says, a unification of units which is not absolute, but the product of organization. *Tertium non datur*. If Professor Calkins attempts, nevertheless, to reconcile the two positions, she does so because she feels that the old traditional view is no longer tenable, and that she has to utilize the data of psychophysics. In fact most of the detailed work of her exposition draws largely upon experimental psychology, which is merely a branch of psychology, and, as it is frequently treated in our laboratories, proves too unsatisfactory to be acceptable as a theory of the soul.

The work of many latter-day psychologists is very insufficient and leaves out of sight some of the most significant features of soul-life, as those features which depend upon character or are experiences of personality as such. A study of their lucubrations, or their experiments, or their expositions, makes one feel like the wanderer, who could not see the woods because of the many trees. Everything is detail, and nowhere is the soul of man as a whole taken into consideration. The truth is that the soul is not a conglomeration of unrelated impulses, but that its unity is the most significant factor in the correlation of the diverse psychic elements that constitute a personality. While we thus support the cause of a monistic psychology we appreciate the significance of the old interpretation, and can very well understand that Professor Calkins does not want to part lightly with some of its most important truths. The result is that she chooses from each side what appeals to her as best.

---

DIE ERKENNTNISTHEORIE DER NATURFORSCHUNG DER GEGENWART. Von *Dr. H. Kleinpeter*. Leipsc: 1905. Pp. xii, 156.

Professor Kleinpeter sums up in this handy little volume the essential features of the modern conception of science, especially modern science, in which the views of Mach, Stallo, Clifford, Kirchhoff, Hertz, Pearson and Ostwald, have been made the foundation of the naturalist's world conception. It is one which discards the revision of the old philosophy, and bases the new philosophy absolutely upon experience. The problems of the book deserve careful and special attention, and we hope that we shall find an opportunity to discuss the difficult points in this new materialism which is at present governing the leading minds of science.